

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 5, 2004. Claims 22 to 25 are pending in this application, with Claims 1 to 21 having been cancelled and Claims 22 to 25 having been added. Claims 22 and 24 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 3, 6, 12 to 15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,594,672 (Hicks) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,438,359 (Aoki), and Claims 4, 5, 7 to 11, 16, 17, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hicks in view of Aoki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,924 (Kikinis). Although the rejections are believed to be obviated by the cancellation of the rejected claims, Applicant submits that newly-added Claims 22 to 25 are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below. Nonetheless, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns a peripheral apparatus which is connectable to a computer. The peripheral apparatus includes a control unit which controls the peripheral apparatus and a power control unit which supplies power from a power source to the control unit. According to one feature of the invention, a check is made whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit, and power supply is continued from the power source to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

Referring specifically to the claims, newly-added independent Claim 22 is directed to a peripheral apparatus which is connectable to a computer. The peripheral

apparatus includes a control unit which controls the peripheral apparatus, and a power control unit which supplies power from a power source to the control unit. The control unit checks whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit. In addition, the power control unit continues to supply power from the power source to the control unit if the control unit determines that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

Newly-added independent Claim 24 is directed to a method for controlling a peripheral apparatus which is connectable to a computer, the peripheral apparatus including a control unit which controls the peripheral apparatus and a power control unit which supplies power from a power source to the control unit. The method includes the step of checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit. The method also includes the step of continuing to supply power from the power source to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the Hicks, Aoki and Kikinis patents are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit, and continuing to supply power from the power source to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

As understood by Applicant, Hicks teaches a device that saves energy by turning on power to a peripheral device such as a printer only when a host computer sends data to its I/O port. See Hicks, Abstract. When the computer I/O port shows some activity, power is supplied to the peripheral and the transition is mediated between the peripheral's power on state and ready state. When the computer I/O port shows no activity, power to the peripheral is eliminated. See Hicks, column 1, lines 60 to 66.

Although Hicks describes controlling power supply to a peripheral device, it bases its decision to supply power on whether activity is present on the computer I/O port. This is different than the present invention, in which a check is made whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. Accordingly, Hicks is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit, and continuing to supply power from the power source to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

Aoki describes an electronic camera with a power circuit that can be supplied power from a battery within the camera or the power source of a personal computer. The power circuit is supplied with power from the battery when the camera is not connected to the personal computer. When the camera is connected to the personal computer, the power supply to the power circuit from the battery is automatically switched to the power supply from the power source of the personal computer. See column 4, lines 14-20.

Although Aoki provides for switching the power supply from the battery within the camera to the power source of the personal computer, Aoki is silent as to checking whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. As a consequence, Aoki could not possibly describe checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer after the computer causes the power control unit to supply power from the power source to the control unit, and continuing to supply power from the power source to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

In addition, Kikinis has been reviewed as is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Hicks and Aoki.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, newly-added independent Claims 22 and 24 are believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 84637v1